

# Eyes in the Sky: Exploring the Intersection of Drone Technology, Artificial Intelligence, and International Humanitarian Law

**Nandana Rajesh**

Research Scholar, School of Legal Studies, Cusat, India  
nandusairajesh99@gmail.com

**Abstract:** *The advent of drone technology powered by Artificial Intelligence (AI) has revolutionized modern warfare, offering precision targeting, enhanced surveillance, and reduced risks to human soldiers. However, the integration of AI into drones has also introduced complex ethical, legal, and humanitarian dilemmas within the framework of International Humanitarian Law (IHL). Although promising for reducing civilian damage and operational efficiency, these technologies simultaneously threaten foundational IHL principles of distinction, proportionality, and necessity. This paper examines critically the dynamic evolution of drone technology, AI, and IHL, unveiling its potential as well as its pitfalls. The core research problem that this paper analyzes involves the inability of the available IHL frameworks to adequately guide or regulate the use of AI-enabled drones in armed conflicts. These machines involve autonomous decision-making capabilities that are a cause for concern regarding accountability, compliance with humanitarian norms, and erosion of more ethical warfare practices. The objectives of the study include analyzing the legal gaps in regulating AI-driven drones, evaluating their impact on civilian protection during armed conflicts, and exploring mechanisms to reconcile technological advancements with humanitarian imperatives.*

*Through an in-depth analysis of case studies, this paper highlights the growing risks of civilian casualties and misuse of drone technology in asymmetric warfare. It discusses the issues arising from the delegation of lethal decisions to algorithms, such as accountability for errors, unpredictability in AI systems, and the difficulty of ensuring compliance with international norms. The study also looks into emerging global trends, such as state practices and international efforts to develop legal frameworks governing the use of AI in warfare. In conclusion, this paper argues for the necessity of IHL modernization due to the unique challenges that AI-powered drones pose. It calls for an interdisciplinary approach toward technological innovation, ethical considerations, and international cooperation to establish a robust regulatory framework. It is designed in such a way as to ensure that the use of AI in warfare aligns itself with humanitarian principles, safeguards human rights, and promotes accountability in the ever-evolving landscape of armed conflict.*

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence

## I. INTRODUCTION

Drone technology has developed from initial applications in the Cold War as reconnaissance and surveillance. Drones, or UAVs, began to gain major traction in military circles in the 1990s, as the U.S. military became one of the first to make operational use of them (Gertler, 2012). Artificial Intelligence (AI) integration in drones has taken the technology to the next level, allowing autonomous decision-making, including real-time target identification, optimization of flight paths, and even lethal strikes without human intervention. AI-driven drones are now a crucial part of modern warfare, especially in precision targeting, surveillance, and reducing risks to human soldiers (Scharre, 2018). Drones empowered by AI form a dramatic technological shift in modern warfare. Their precision targeting capabilities driven through AI algorithms provide them with accuracy in strikes while minimizing collateral damage particularly in complex urban environments or conflict zones containing a non-combatant population (Lin, 2020). AI-powered drones add new

platform benefits for ISR operations, increasing real-time situational awareness, and improving operational efficiency in military strategy. However, this technological progress introduces critical concerns about the loss of human oversight and the ethical implications of delegating life-or-death decisions to machines (Gubrud, 2020).

International Humanitarian Law (IHL) is a body of law that governs the conduct of armed conflict and seeks to protect those who are not participating in hostilities, including civilians, prisoners of war, and the wounded. Its core tenets are aimed to ensure military actions remain proportionate, necessary, and discriminate between combatants and non-combatants (International Committee of the Red Cross [ICRC], 2020). While principles such as accountability, protection to civilians, and the possibility that such technologies, in principle, can adhere to the core provisions of IHL, including discrimination, proportionality, and necessity, remain (Schmitt, 2019). AI introduction into drone technologies poses a more fundamental challenge toward the current understanding of International Humanitarian Law frameworks. While drones are capable of precision strikes that could minimize civilian casualties, the increased autonomy of such machines raises substantial legal concerns. Current IHL frameworks are ill-equipped to handle issues of accountability, transparency in AI decision-making, and the assurance that autonomous drones respect the principles of distinction, proportionality, and necessity under IHL (Shiner, 2020).

This paper reflects on the gaps of these frameworks and how they can be adapted to the complexities that AI-equipped drones present in armed conflict. Research objectives includes, evaluation on the current IHL framework about the use of AI-driven drones, discussion of ethical issues of accountability and civilian protection, and compliance of AI-equipped drones with the core principles of IHL, including distinction, proportionality, and necessity. The paper attempts to outline potential reforms in IHL that would better regulate the deployment of AI-driven drones in warfare and keep their use consistent with humanitarian law and ethical standards (Scharre, 2018).

### **Technological Evolution of Drones and Artificial Intelligence**

The development of drone technology has revolutionized modern warfare, evolving from rudimentary reconnaissance tools to sophisticated AI-driven combat systems. The earliest recorded use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) in a military context dates back to World War I, where pilotless aircraft were experimented with for surveillance and attack missions. However, it was not until the late 20th century that drones began to play a significant role in military operations. The deployment of drones by the U.S. military during the Gulf War and its continuation in the Global War on Terror was the turning point when their strategic importance in intelligence gathering, targeted strikes, and real-time surveillance were proven (Gertler, 2012). Over the years, advances in artificial intelligence have added even more capabilities to drones, such that they are now able to function with the least amount of human intervention, thus increasing their effectiveness on the battlefield.

Artificial intelligence has played a significant role in the evolution of drone technology, transforming unmanned aerial vehicles from remotely piloted machines into highly autonomous systems. AI-powered drones use machine learning, neural networks, and image recognition algorithms to identify targets, optimize flight paths, and execute combat operations with high precision (Lin, 2020). These systems are able to process real-time large amounts of data, making them responsive to changes in the battlefield, thereby providing improved mission effectiveness. The introduction of AI to the drones also enabled the drones to make decisions in place of the human operators, who needed far less to operate the drones. Deep learning algorithms with discrimination capabilities between combatants and civilians have now been implemented in advanced drones in order to minimize collateral damage on non-combatants. However, the reliability of these AI-driven decisions remains a subject of concern, particularly in unpredictable and dynamic combat environments (Schmitt, 2019).

A significant distinction exists between remotely piloted drones and fully autonomous systems. Traditional drones require continuous human oversight, with operators controlling their movements and actions from remote locations. In contrast, autonomous drones function independently, relying on pre-programmed algorithms and AI-driven decision-making processes. These AWS are designed to identify threats, engage targets, and adapt to the battlefield conditions, all of which can be performed autonomously without human intervention (Scharre, 2018). Though many advantages of autonomous drone warfare occur in increased operational efficiency and lesser risks for human soldiers, they also pose complicated issues of ethics and legality. The shift from human-controlled drones to AI-driven systems challenges the

existing frameworks of accountability, as it becomes increasingly difficult to determine who is responsible for errors or unintended casualties.

The integration of AI in warfare has led to the emergence of autonomous weapons systems, a rapidly growing trend that has sparked debates among policymakers, military strategists, and human rights advocates. AI-powered drones have shown impressive promise in terms of precision targeting, minimizing human loss, and undertaking complex missions within high-risk operational environments. Being free from human intervention, the systems can act on threats sooner than traditional forces, thereby achieving greater battlefield effectiveness (Shiner, 2020). There are also several risks associated with the use of AI-driven drones. Loss of human oversight over decision-making is a significant issue because autonomous systems can behave unpredictably or even commit fatal mistakes. Additionally, the question of ethical issues arising from delegating lethal force to machines remains extremely controversial. Critics argue that AI lacks moral reasoning and cannot be held accountable for violations of international humanitarian law, raising concerns about compliance with the principles of distinction, proportionality, and necessity in armed conflict (Gubrud, 2020).

As AI-driven drones continue to shape the future of warfare, their implications extend beyond the battlefield. This trend in reliance on autonomous systems has generated discussions about the necessity of international regulations governing the use of these systems. There are countries advocating for the development of AI-based weapons as a means of staying ahead of other nations, while others advocate for more stringent legal frameworks that ensure accountability and check potential misuse. The difficulty here is in trying to balance the benefits of harnessing AI-driven warfare with the humanitarian principles and legal standards. Without clear regulations and ethical guidelines, the unchecked deployment of AI-powered drones could lead to unforeseen consequences, further complicating the already complex landscape of modern armed conflict (ICRC, 2020).

### **International Humanitarian Law and the Regulation of Drone Warfare**

International Humanitarian Law (IHL) is the legal framework that primarily regulates armed conflicts with the intention of reducing human suffering and making warfare an ethical endeavor. The principles of IHL are distinction, proportionality, and necessity. These are fundamental principles used to determine whether drone warfare is legal or not. The principle of distinction requires parties to armed conflict to distinguish between combatants and civilians so that military actions are not targeted at non-combatants. AI-powered drones are theoretically designed to be more accurate in targeting through advanced recognition technologies. However, questions arise on the reliability of these systems to identify lawful targets, especially when the combat environment is complex, with civilians and military personnel looking alike. The risks of misidentification and algorithmic bias have been identified to lead to unintentional civilian casualties, which breach IHL (Melzer, 2019).

The principle of proportionality also limits the harm created by military activities to not being excessive in comparison to the probable military gain. Although AI-governed drones may enhance target accuracy, this principle is a matter of great debate. Since autonomous drones gather large amounts of data to study threats, often the unpredictability of war and its consequences makes collateral damage unwarranted and unintended. Asymmetric conflicts, in which non-state actors operate among civilians, only blur the line of distinction between legitimate and illegitimate targets. It raises ethical and legal questions concerning the likelihood that machine miscalculations would lead to an excessive use of force, hence demanding closer attention to AI in warfare decision-making (Solis, 2021).

Necessity only justifies the use of force when no reasonable alternative is available to attain a legitimate military objective. Drones have often been praised for their potential ability to make surgical strikes without sending many troops into the battlefield, hence minimizing the risk of human soldier casualties. However, reliance on drones leads one to question the justification of persistent surveillance and targeted assassinations. Increased reliance on drones in counterterrorism efforts, increasingly outside traditional battlefields, does not fit within the traditional understanding of the concept of necessity. AI-capable drones may increase the proneness threshold for engaging in conflict and make a more grave use of lethal force readily deployable, contrary to the often-declared principle that military operations should be the last resort (Watkin, 2020).

Well-established principles notwithstanding, the current framework of IHL is failing to regulate AI-enabled drone warfare. The legal guidelines regarding armed conflicts are defined within the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols but were drafted long before the advent of autonomous weapons. These treaties primarily regulate human

decision-making in warfare, creating gaps in addressing autonomous systems that function without direct human oversight. AI-powered drones challenge traditional definitions of combatants, military objectives, and permissible force. The lack of explicit legal provisions governing the use of autonomous drones raises concerns about their compliance with IHL, particularly regarding civilian protection and accountability (Casey-Maslen, 2021).

The introduction of autonomy in warfare further complicates legal assessments of target identification and military objectives. Traditionally, accountability in military operations would lie with commanders who authorize attacks based on any intelligence and strategic considerations involved. Nonetheless, AI-driven drones now insert layers of machine-led decision-making - it is challenging to trace where responsibility would lie in case of errors. If an AI system consequently identifies a civilian as a combatant, it becomes problematic to tell who is liable. The delegation of lethality to algorithms is problematic since existing legal doctrines are not calibrated to respond to decisions by non-human actors; the mechanisms that are used today to establish intent and fault simply do not translate well to such systems, since decisions result from processes that may be automated and not necessarily under direct human control (Schmitt, 2021).

More and more reliance on lethal autonomous systems puts very serious questions at the heart of accountability in war. When an AI-powered drone launches a strike that causes illegal civilian deaths, the question arises as to where responsibility lies. Is it the developers responsible for designing the algorithm, military operators deploying the system, or the state sanctioning its use? It has left the international community in a dangerous precedent in which IHL violations will remain unpunished simply because the culprits are not traceable. Also, international mechanisms like war crimes tribunals are founded on evidence of human intent, a notion that can be quite difficult to determine especially in cases where decisions are taken by AI-driven systems (Heyns et al., 2020).

With these legal and ethical issues, the updating of IHL is essential for dealing with reality in AI-empowered war. Current laws are not in a position to govern emerging technologies that are supposed to function above the human way of doing things. While a few states promote an outright prohibition of lethal autonomous weapons, some others support regulatory measures that observe humanitarian principles. The establishment of legal standards that can regulate human oversight in all AI-driven military decisions would ensure that the final accountability lay with the human actor. Further, there should be international agreements that specify under what conditions an autonomous drone could be deployed while further defining permissible levels of autonomy and outlining accountability mechanisms (Boulanin & Verbruggen, 2020).

The evolving nature of warfare calls for proactive legal reforms to prevent humanitarian crises that unchecked technological advancements cause. The international community must enter into multilateral discussions to establish regulatory frameworks that balance military interests with human rights protections. Compliance mechanisms need to be strengthened, and transparency in AI decision-making processes must be enhanced while encouraging ethical AI development to align autonomous warfare with humanitarian imperatives. Without concrete legal measures, the use of AI-powered drones risks eroding established norms in warfare, undermining civilian protections, and creating new threats to global security (ICRC, 2021)

### **Ethical and Humanitarian Implications of AI-Powered Drones**

The integration of artificial intelligence in drone warfare raises important ethical and humanitarian concerns, especially in the context of delegating life-and-death decisions to autonomous systems. AI-powered drones are capable of performing their missions with minimal human intervention, which leads to debates on moral accountability in armed conflict. Algorithms do not possess the ability to make moral reasoning, emotional intelligence, or ethical judgment like human decision-makers, and thus their lethal decisions are a matter of controversy. The most significant ethical challenge is the "black box" problem: AI systems are opaque, not transparent, and lack comprehensible reasoning for making decisions. It is difficult to assign accountability in such cases where AI-driven drones cause unintended harm, raising concerns about legal liability and justice for affected civilians.

Drone technology has been increasingly used in counter-terrorism operations due to asymmetric warfare, where state and non-state actors engage in highly unpredictable combat scenarios. Although these technologies present strategic benefits, like threat neutralization without risk to military personnel, they have been accompanied by hundreds of civilian casualties. Empirical data on drone strikes are abundant, showing that misidentifications and algorithmic biases

and technical errors are seen as reasons why many non-combatants suffer from unintended harm in violation of international humanitarian law. The widespread use of drones in areas with heavy civilian populations is a risk in itself, because it violates the principle of distinction between combatants and non-combatants.

Advocates of AI-equipped drones claim that their precision-targeting capabilities enhance operational efficiency while reducing overall casualties in conflict areas. AI algorithms can process real-time vast data, improving the detection of threats and minimizing damage to non-combatants. However, in reality, such systems have proven to be inconsistent in that AI cannot take into account the intricacies of a battlefield. Factors like adversarial manipulation, environmental changes, and unanticipated civilian presence can create discrepancies in AI calculations, causing them to make incorrect attacks. The unpredictability of AI decision-making underscores the need for human oversight, constant review, and rigid adherence to humanitarian principles so that technological developments do not supersede basic ethical and legal imperatives.

### **Case Studies of AI-Powered Drones in Warfare**

The United States has led the charge of drone warfare, particularly with regard to targeted killings in the Middle East and Africa. From early 2000s to present, the United States has operated drones very frequently in its counterterrorism campaigns targeting high-value targets in areas including Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, and Somalia. While supporters of drone strikes argue for enhanced precision and minimization of risks for American soldiers, critics raise considerable ethical and legal issues. Detractors argue that there have been civilian casualties, with examples of mistaken identities and collateral damage. The U.S. drone program has come under increasing criticism for its lack of transparency over target selection criteria and lawful bases used to justify extrajudicial killings. Questions about compliance with international humanitarian law remain, most particularly with respect to the principles of distinction and proportionality.

Another point of contention has been the use of drones by Israel in its military operations particularly in Gaza. Israeli drones have been instrumental in surveillance, intelligence gathering, and precision strikes that target Hamas and other militant groups. However, human rights organizations and international bodies have expressed concern about the effects of these drone strikes on civilian populations. Reports of high civilian casualties and the destruction of critical infrastructure have fueled allegations of disproportionate force. Legal and diplomatic challenges also arose with the drone operations by Israel, with international organizations questioning the country's adherence to humanitarian principles. The ongoing war has raised controversial discussions on whether using AI-led drones in such highly populated zones is legal or even ethical.

Increasingly, drone warfare has started to turn to full autonomy with many nations and defense firms researching AI-powered autonomous arms. Unlike existing drones, whose operations are bound by human direction, especially to pick and decide upon a target before executing an action, such drones will carry out lethal tasks entirely on their own. These improvements promise significantly faster speed and efficiency in combat, but with profound uncertainties for law and ethics. Unpredictability is coupled with no clear mechanisms of accountability when considering the decision-making of AI, making autonomous drones a contentious issue on global security discussions. The possibility of AI-driven conflict, whereby autonomous weapons wage war without human input, demands urgent international regulation to prevent the erosion of humanitarian safeguards that its practice in warfare catalyzes.

### **Regulatory and International Responses**

Growing concerns over the use of AI-powered drones for militaristic purposes have led to numerous international and national regulatory moves. The United Nations has been seen as the leader in discussions related to lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS). The UN's Group of Governmental Experts under its Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons has had repeated sessions discussing the legal and ethical connotations of an autonomous drone. While some states advocate for a preemptive ban on fully autonomous weapons, others argue for a regulatory framework that ensures meaningful human control over AI-driven systems. However, consensus remains elusive, and international negotiations continue to face challenges due to differing national security interests and technological ambitions. The inclusion of AI-driven drones within existing arms control treaties, such as the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and the Geneva Conventions, has also been explored. However, given the rapid evolution of drone technology, many existing

treaties lack the specificity needed to regulate autonomous weapons comprehensively.

Countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Israel have developed distinct approaches to regulating drone warfare. The U.S. has developed a strong rule of law in strikes, with its foundation within executive orders, military protocols, and intelligence directives. Despite that, the secrecy surrounding targeted killings is criticized for lacking transparency, mainly concerning the lack of oversight over AI-driven targeting choices. The UK instead has taken a more careful approach, such as following the principles of international humanitarian law and obliging a human to oversee lethal operations. Israel has been known for its advanced capabilities in drones. AI-driven drones have been implemented extensively in Israeli military operations in surveillance and targeted strikes. Even though each of these countries holds different legal and ethical standards, the absence of a single worldwide framework makes accountability and enforcement cumbersome. The problem of national strategy differences also highlights the larger challenges of aligning legal principles with technological advancements in modern warfare.

Advocacy is an essential function that NGOs are fulfilling regarding increasing the regulatory level on AI drones. Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch are but two examples of human rights groups actively promoting the need for an international legal framework for regulating autonomous weapons systems; such actions need to ensure adherence to humanitarian law. Such NGOs carry out research, collect accounts of civilian losses, and discuss with the relevant international institutions issues related to drone warfare. Civil society groups have also played a very significant role in putting pressure on governments to ensure that the use of AI-driven drones is transparent and that clear legal frameworks are put in place that prevent any violation of human rights. The continued evolution of technology means that NGOs' advocacy efforts remain pivotal in shaping global discourse on the ethical and legal dimensions of AI in military operations.

## II. CONCLUSION AND APPRAISAL

With the integration of AI-based drones in modern warfare, the character of armed conflict has dramatically changed, enhancing precision and intelligence efficiency of operations. However, increased autonomy of drones raises complex legal, ethical, and humanitarian concerns. An examination of AI-drivers from the perspective of international humanitarian law (IHL) discovers gaps in accountability, processes of compliance with fundamental principles of distinction and proportionality, and broader issues of meaningful human oversight of such combat systems. The case studies highlighted both the strategic advantages of drone warfare and the potential for serious humanitarian consequences, including civilian casualties and violations of existing legal norms.

To overcome these challenges, reforming IHL to accommodate technological advancements is essential. Existing legal frameworks need to evolve in order to clarify accountability mechanisms for AI-driven decisions in warfare so that responsibility can be assigned to states, commanders, or developers of autonomous systems. Ethical standards are also needed for the use of AI in warfare, focusing on transparency, accountability, and adherence to humanitarian norms. International standards for the use of AI in military operations would be established by cooperation among states, international organizations, and other non-governmental actors. Multilateral policymaking and treaty-based regulation can further reduce the risk of fully autonomous drones and help keep AI war within humanitarian boundaries.

All in all, further development in AI technology makes it imperative to maintain a balance between military innovation and ethical responsibility. International law will only be effective in this global context if it learns to adapt to the realities of AI-driven warfare. Unchecked escalation must be prevented, while civilians are safeguarded against the unintended consequences of autonomous weapons. The future of warfare depends on technological progress but is also dictated by the global community that can establish legal and ethical safeguards that stay true to fundamental principles of humanity.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Amnesty International. (2023). AI and Warfare: The Legal and Human Rights Challenges of Autonomous Drones. AI Policy Brief.
- [2]. Arms Control Association. (2023). The Future of Arms Control: Addressing Autonomous Weapons Systems. ACA Policy Brief.

- [3]. Asaro, P. (2021). *The Black Box Problem in AI and Autonomous Weapons Systems: Accountability and Transparency Issues*. Oxford University Press.
- [4]. Boulanin, V., & Verbruggen, M. (2020). *Mapping the Development of Autonomy in Weapon Systems*. Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.
- [5]. Boyle, M. (2020). *The Drone Age: How Drone Technology Will Change War and Peace*. Oxford University Press.
- [6]. Callamard, A. (2021). *Targeted Killing, Drones, and International Law: The Human Rights Challenge*. Cambridge University Press.
- [7]. Casey-Maslen, S. (2021). *Autonomous Weapons and International Law: Addressing the Challenges of AI in Armed Conflict*. Routledge.
- [8]. Crotoft, R. (2021). *War Torts: Accountability and Liability in AI-Driven Military Operations*. Cambridge University Press.
- [9]. Future of Life Institute. (2022). *Autonomous Weapons and the Risk of AI-driven Warfare*. FLI Publications.
- [10]. Gertler, J. (2012). *U.S. Unmanned Aerial Systems*. Congressional Research Service.
- [11]. Gubrud, M. (2020). *The Ethics and Law of Autonomous Weapons Systems*. Cambridge University Press.
- [12]. Heyns, C., et al. (2020). *Autonomous Weapons and Human Rights: Challenges for the International Legal System*. Oxford University Press.
- [13]. Human Rights Watch. (2022). *Stopping Killer Robots: Why the World Needs to Ban Fully Autonomous Weapons*. HRW Reports.
- [14]. International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). (2020). *International Humanitarian Law: Questions & Answers*. ICRC.
- [15]. International Committee of the Red Cross. (2022). *Autonomy in Weapon Systems: Human Control and Compliance with IHL*. ICRC Reports.
- [16]. Kahn, P. *Drones and the Future of Armed Conflict: Ethical, Legal, and Strategic Implications*. Routledge.
- [17]. Lin, P. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Warfare: Military Applications and Ethical Implications*. Oxford University Press.
- [18]. Lin, P., Bekey, G., & Abney, K. (2020). *Robot Ethics 2.0: From Autonomous Cars to Artificial Intelligence*. Oxford University Press.
- [19]. Melzer, N. (2019). *Human Rights Implications of Drone Warfare*. Oxford University Press.
- [20]. Scharre, P. (2018). *Army of None: Autonomous Weapons and the Future of War*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- [21]. Schmitt, M. (2019). *Autonomous Weapons and International Humanitarian Law: Law and Ethics of AI and Drone Warfare*. Cambridge University Press.
- [22]. Schmitt, M. (2021). *Lethal Autonomous Weapons and the Law of Armed Conflict: Emerging Legal Issues*. Cambridge University Press.
- [23]. Sharkey, N. (2020). *The Automation of Warfare: Ethical and Legal Challenges in AI-driven Combat*. Routledge.
- [24]. Sharkey, N. (2021). *The Automation of Warfare: Ethical and Legal Challenges*. Oxford University Press.
- [25]. Shiner, M. (2020). *Drones and International Law: The Ethics of AI-Enabled Warfare*. Cambridge University Press.
- [26]. Solis, G. (2021). *The Law of Armed Conflict: International Humanitarian Law in War*. Cambridge University Press.
- [27]. Sparrow, R. (2021). *Killer Robots: Ethical and Moral Challenges of Autonomous Weapons*. MIT Press.
- [28]. UN Human Rights Council. (2022). *Report on Civilian Impact of Drone Strikes in the Middle East*. United Nations.
- [29]. United Nations. (2023). *Report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems*. UN Publications.
- [30]. Watkin, K. (2020). *Fighting at the Legal Boundaries: Controlling the Use of Force in Contemporary Conflict*. Oxford University Press.
- [31]. Weizman, E. (2021). *The Least of All Possible Evils: Humanitarian Violence from Airstrikes to Gaza*. Verso.